DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 275 AC 014 463

AUTHOR Veri, Clive C.; And Others
TITLE Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness in Extension-Administered Programs.
INSTITUTION Missouri Univ., St. Louis. Extension Div.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 15p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Effective Teaching; Evaluation Techniques; *Extension Education; Followup Studies; Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

The Extension Division Committee of the University of Missouri, St. Louis, in addressing itself to evaluating teaching effectiveness in extension-administered programs, held as central concerns: (1) that most evaluation systems tend to be subjective; (2) that evaluations of programs and faculty who taught in them must be undertaken; (3) that evaluative information, once accumulated, could provide meaningful insight into a faculty member's teaching effectiveness; and (4) that faculty members should be able to choose how they wanted to be evaluated. The following summarizes the system presented here: (1) Each Extension program will be evaluated by Form A; (2) Each faculty member who participated in the program (for 45 minutes or more) will be evaluated either by a short or long form or by a jury of peers; and (3) Follow-up evaluations will be conducted to determine the long-range impact of extension programs. Evaluation Forms A through D are provided. (Author/CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 078275

# EVALUATING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS IN EXTENSION-ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS*

By the Extension Division Committee to
Evaluate Teaching Effectiveness at
the University of Missouri-St. Louis

Clive C. Veri, Associate Dean and Committee Chairman
Frederick Brechler, Assistant Dean of Extension for Arts and Sciences
Sam Lloyd, Director, Extension - Business Programs
Angelo Puricelli, Assistant Dean of Extension for Education

## Introduction

Evaluating teaching effectiveness is both a private and public matter. It is private when viewed by an individual faculty member who uses the evaluation data as a benchmark to institute improvement in his or her classroom performance. It is public matter when a group of adult learners asks the question: "Has the time I spent in this continuing education class been worthwhile and productive to me and/or my employer?"

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the extension classroom is now, and always has been, occurring. Adult learners, many of whom are employed and all of whom bring experience and often vastly diverse backgrounds into the extension classroom, leave the learning experience with attitudes ranging on a continuum from "This was the most worthwhile program I have ever attended" to "Wow, was my time wasted!" The ultimate response of the learners, exhibited in overt behavior, is that they are either eager to return, or vow never to return, to the continuing education classroom.

*"Extension programs" as used in this document refer to special, short-term, non-credit, continuing education programs for adults such as conferences, institutes, workshops and colloquia. It was not within the charge of the Committee to design a system to evaluate faculty teaching in extension-administered courses for credit.

AEC 14463

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Faculty themselves now evaluate, and have always evaluated, their extension classroom performance. Such evaluation ranges from formal measures of behavioral change induced in the learners to non-measurement resulting in a personal reaction summed in a generalized phrase like "I did well today--I feel that I really taught those students." Whoever evaluates teaching effectiveness in extension programs by whatever method, one fact is clear: extension programs and faculty who teach in them are always evaluated--either formally or informally.

The plan presented here is for a system to evaluate teaching effectiveness in extension programs designed to formalize and standardize the evaluation process. The rationale for evaluation is based, in part, upon the following factors:

1. The extension function of a faculty member is one of the three missions of a state university and land-grant college. Evaluation is mandated if UMSL is to conduct viable and meaningful extension programs which serve the educational needs of Missourians. For example, resident teaching is evaluated. Research (and the resulting publications) is evaluated. It logically follows that extension programs and faculty who teach them must be evaluated.
2. All levels of education, whether financially supported by tax dollars or private dollars, are being held accountable for performance.
3. Faculty members, by and large, want to be evaluated. They want to know how well they perform in order to have information upon which their teaching behaviors can be altered.

Faculty, by nature of their profession, continually seek ways of improving their classroom performance.

4. Promotion and tenure committees need data upon which to base their recommendation that a faculty member be raised to the next academic rank and/or be granted tenure. Since teaching in extension programs is a part of a faculty member's responsibility at a state university and land-grant college, it is logical that information related to this performance be sought by, and be of value to, promotion and tenure committees.

This rationale addresses itself to "Why evaluate teaching effectiveness in extension programs?" When discussing any evaluation--especially of teaching effectiveness-one must look at the objectiveness of measurement and the confounding variables which affect evaluation.

Objectiveness of Evaluating Teaching Performance

The evaluation of teaching is subjective, at best, whether that evaluation is done in a college credit classroom with undergraduates or in an extension non-credit, continuing education classroom with adult learners. The literature dealing with the evaluation of teaching points out that the variables which affect evaluation and includes such factors as class size, content of instruction, why the learner participates, whether the program is at the graduate or undergraduate level, personality of the instructor, experiential limitations of the learners, prior course expectations, the learner's background, age, sex, health, attitudes and values just to mention a few.

The evaluation of learning, by contrast, if conducted to measure behavioral

change induced in the learners, can be objective given that the evaluation is carefully and systematically undertaken. An ideal procedure is to measure the cognitive, affective and psychomotor skills of the learners before they enter the learning process, teach to behaviorally defined objectives, and then measure what has been learned with somewhat detailed objective tests. The tests must be designed meticulously using accepted test construction methods and procedures. Follow-up testing at some later time to measure retention of learning completes the ideal model.

While evaluation of learning can be objective, it is nearly impossible to do in an extension program of limited duration. Even though this kind of evaluation would be the best indicator of teaching effectiveness, we are forced to settle for the kind of evaluation which is used in the college credit classroom. That is, we turn to the opinions of learners (or a jury of peers) to obtain an expression of their feelings as to whether or not a teacher was effective. This kind of evaluation tends to be subjective, but it must be understood that even the judgement of a promotion and tenure committee is based on subjective data. That is to say, the expressions of scholars who critique research are subjective, the opinions of peers about a colleague's publication are subjective, and the feelings of students about a teacher's effectiveness are subjective. And, while an administrator might well place justifiable reliance on the advice of a promotion and tenure committee, his ultimate decision rests on subjective information.

## A System for Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness in Extension-Administered Programs at UMSL

There are three levels of evaluation which the Committee suggests. The first

deals with an overall program evaluation and the second deals with specific evaluation of a faculty member's teaching performance in a program. The third, related to evaluation of the overall program and of teaching effectiveness, is concerned with a follow-up method of evaluation.

Evaluating Extension Programs

The Committee recommends that the Continuing Education Program Evaluation Form presented as Appendix A be administered at the conclusion of an extension program.

The reason for the use of this form is that it is recognized, by evaluating a program in its entirety, proper assessment may be made of the contribution of individual faculty members who participated in the program.

Operationally, it shall be the responsibility of the extension education coordinator in charge of the program to administer this instrument and tabulate the results. For every program, a copy of the evaluation shall be transmitted to the dean of extension, assistant dean (or director) in charge of the program, and to each member of the planning committee who helped to plan the program. The assistant dean or director shall transmit a copy of the overall evaluation to each faculty member who taught in the program as well as to the chairman of the sponsoring academic department(s) and dean of the appropriate school or college. The director of non-credit programs shall maintain a file of all program evaluations.

It is suggested that the form be used for a period of one year and then be evaluated to ascertain its effectiveness in improving the quality of extension programs and teaching effectiveness of faculty.

Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness

The Committee recommends two levels of faculty evaluations as well as an alternate plan for both of these evaluations.

Level 1. The Faculty Evaluation Form presented as Appendix B-1 is to be used when a faculty member teaches in an extension program from three quarters of an hour to three hours of contact time.

Level 2. The Faculty Evaluation Form presented as Appendix B-2 is to be used when a faculty member teaches in an extension program for three or more hours of contact time.

Operationally, both forms are to be tailor-made for each program by inserting the name(s) of the faculty member(s) in the appropriate space and then duplicated. All persons appearing on the program shall be evaluated including adjunct faculty. While the assistant dean or program director will be responsible to see that the evaluations are completed, the extension coordinator will administer the instruments and transmit the originals to the appropriate assistant dean or director who shall review the evaluations and consult individually with each faculty member.

In the event that the program will not allow sufficient time for learners to complete the Form B-2 evaluations, the coordinator will mail the form to a random sample of registrants. Included with the form shall be a self-addressed envelope with a cover letter of explanation stressing the importance of the evaluation and urging the registrant to return the completed form.

The evaluation forms are not to be reproduced by any means in order to maintain confidentiality of the information. In no instance is the information to be shown to anyone other than the faculty member to whom the evaluation applies.

It will be the responsibility of the assistant dean or program director to transmit the evaluations to the dean of extension along with an optional cover letter which contains any pertinent observations about the faculty member's teaching performance. The evaluations will be appropriately filed (by faculty name); included with the evaluation shall be a brochure or course announcement pertaining to the program as well as copy of the overall program evaluation form.

The assistant dean or program director shall have access to the file during normal office hours. Under no circumstances shall information be removed from the files.

Alternate Evaluation Plan. Should a faculty member desire, he or she may choose not to be evaluated by the learners but elect to be evaluated by a jury of peers. (See Appendix C for the suggested evaluation form.) If he follows this plan, he must submit a list of three colleagues from any campus of the University of Missouri and a list of three practitioners from outside the University community who are in position to judge his teaching effectiveness. The assistant dean or program director shall randomly select two people from the list of six and arrange for them to attend the program to rate the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.

The evaluation form shall not be reproduced by any means in order to maintain its confidential nature. In no instance is the information to be shared with anyone other than the faculty member to whom the evaluation applies.

The forms will then be forwarded to the dean of extension for filing. The assistant dean or program director may wish to include a letter of transmittal covering pertinent information which has a bearing on the jury's evaluation of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. The evaluations will be

filed by faculty name; included with the evaluations shall be a course announcement or brochure, and a copy of the overall program evaluation form.

A faculty member requesting the jury evaluation is to let his wishes be known at least thirty days prior to the time he is to appear on the program. A stipend of $10 per observation hour shall be paid to each member of the jury. Should a jury member have to travel more than fifty miles (round trip) to the site of the program, he shall also be reimbursed for travel (from UMSL) and other necessary expenses as determined by the assistant dean or the program director of extension.

Follow-up Evaluation

Approximately six months after a program has been completed, the assistant dean or program director will conduct a follow-up evaluation of selected extension programs by interviewing a sample of program participants. This interview will be a structured telephone interview following the form which is presented as Appendix D. A key element to be investigated in this evaluation is behavioral change attributable to participation in the extension-administered program.

This follow-up interview will provide additional evaluative data which can be compared with the evaluation obtained at the immediate conclusion of the program. Such information will add to the objectivity of the overall evaluation.

The assistant dean or program director will forward the information to the dean of extension with an optional letter of transmittal. The form will be filed in each faculty member's file who taught in the program. Should the assistant dean deem it appropriate, the information will be shared with the committee which planned the program and the faculty who taught in it.

## Summary

The Committee, in addressing itself to evaluating teaching effectiveness in extension-administered programs, held as central concerns: (1) that most evaluation systems tend to be subjective; (2) that evaluations of programs and faculty who taught in them must be undertaken; (3) that evaluative information, once accumulated, could provide meaningful insight into a faculty member's teaching effectiveness; and (4) that faculty members should be able to choose how they wanted to be evaluated.

The following will summarize the system presented here:

1. Each Extension program will be evaluated by Form A.
2. Each faculty member who participated in the program (for forty-five minutes or more) will be evaluated either by:
   a) a short form (B-1) or long form (B-2)
   b) by a jury of peers (C)
3. Follow-up evaluations will be conducted to determine the long-range impact of extension programs (D).

A

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS
Extension Division

## Continuing Education Program Evaluation Form

NAME OF PROGRAM: _____ DATE: _____

An important part of any educational program is its evaluation. Your help in assisting the Extension Division to improve its programs will be of great help in planning similar programs. We are not searching for compliments; we need your honest opinion about the program you have just completed.

1. How would you rate the overall program as an educational experience?
   ☐ Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

2. To what extent did the program content meet your needs and interests?
   ☐ Very Well ☐ To some extent ☐ Very little

3. What would you have added to the program?

4. What would you have deleted from the program?

5. What benefits (if any) did you receive from participating in the program?

6. How would you rate the following?

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Facilities | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Meals | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Helpfulness of staff | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

7. Please comment *critically* on any or all of the presentations:

8. Will your job or personal behavior change as a result of this continuing education program?
   ☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Undecided ☐ Probably Not ☐ Definitely Not
   If yes, HOW?

9. OTHER COMMENTS:

Name: _____ (optional)

Date: _____

July, 1973

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS
Extension Division

**Faculty Evaluation Form B-1**

**B-1**

NAME OF PROGRAM:_____ DATE:_____

If you have not had an opportunity to observe a given faculty member, please draw a line through his or her name.

| Faculty Member | | Relevance of material | Organization of material (logical sequence) | Teaching techniques (methods appropriate to material) | Clarity of presentation | Responsiveness to needs and interest of group |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| _____ | Exc. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Good | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Fair | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Poor | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _____ | Exc. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Good | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Fair | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Poor | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _____ | Exc. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Good | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Fair | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Poor | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _____ | Ex. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Good | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Fair | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Poor | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _____ | Exc. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Good | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Fair | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Poor | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _____ | Exc. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Good | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Fair | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Poor | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _____ | Exc. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Good | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Fair | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Poor | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _____ | Exc. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Good | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Fair | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Poor | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

COMMENTS:

Name:_____

Date:_____

Please note that the information you provide will be kept confidential. You need not sign the evaluation form if you do not wish to do so. Only summaries of all of the evaluations will be shared with the instructors.

July, 1973

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS
Extension Division

# Faculty Evaluation Form B-2

**B-2**

Name of Instructor Being Evaluated: _____

Name of Program: _____ Date: _____

Each of the statements below deals with a characteristic of instructors which adults feel to be important. Please rate the instructor whose name appears above by placing a check mark (✓) in the box which best expresses your opinion about him.

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Just be honest in your rating and express your own feelings. When the information is shared with the instructor, your name will not be associated with it. You may or may not wish to sign the form.

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The instructor was helpful to me when I had difficulty in understanding the material he presented | | | | | |
| 2. He (or she) appeared sensitive to my feelings and problems | | | | | |
| 3. He was flexible (changed his plans to meet my interests and needs) | | | | | |
| 4. He made me feel free to ask questions, disagree, and express my ideas | | | | | |
| 5. His speech was adequate for teaching | | | | | |
| 6. He was interested in the subject | | | | | |
| 7. He used illustrations or examples to clarify materials | | | | | |
| 8. He presented materials in a well-organized manner | | | | | |
| 9. The instructor stimulated my thinking | | | | | |
| 10. He presented material in an interesting way | | | | | |
| 11. His instructional materials (including audiovisuals) were pertinent to the topics presented. | | | | | |
| 12. He made it clear how the topic was related to my needs | | | | | |
| 13. He seemed well-prepared to teach this class | | | | | |
| 14. Class time was seldom or never wasted | | | | | |
| 15. Overall, he was one of the best instructors I have ever had | | | | | |

Please make additional comments about the instructor which you feel are important to his teaching effectiveness.

Name: _____

Date: _____

July, 1973

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS
Extension Division

**C**

## Jury Evaluation Form for Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty member being evaluated: _____

Name of Extension program: _____

Date: _____ No. of hours observed: _____

Each of the items below deals with a characteristic of instructors which adult learners feel to be important. Rate the faculty member by placing a check mark at the appropriate point on the scale. Please add your comments under each question which will clarify or explain your rating.

1. Was the faculty member organized?

well organized — disorganized

Use this space for examples or comments.

2. Did he (or she) present material in a logical sequence?

logical — illogical

3. Was the instructor interested in the subject?

uninterested — interested

4. Did he use illustrations or examples to clarify key points?

none — many

5. Did he take into consideration the unique experience and backgrounds of the learners?

very much — little

6. Did the instructor seem to stimulate learners' thinking?

not at all — very much

7. Did he dwell upon the obvious?

dwelled on obvious — introduced interesting ideas

OVER

8. Was the faculty member flexible (for example, did he change his plans to meet the expressed needs of the learners)?

flexible ——— rigid

9. Were his learning objectives clear to the learners?

obvious ——— not clear at all

10. Did he appear sensitive to the students' feelings and problems?

insensitive ——— very sensitive

11. Did he encourage questions, disagreements, discussion?

very encouraging ——— intolerant

12. Was his speech adequate for teaching?

inadequate ——— very adequate

13. Did he present the material in an interesting way?

dull ——— very interesting

14. Overall, how would you rate the faculty member on his teaching effectiveness?

among the top 10% of faculty I have known ——— among the least effective I have known

Use this space for examples or comments.

Please go back over the list and place a check mark (✓) before the five items which you consider to be most important in evaluating a faculty member's teaching effectiveness.

Based on what you have observed in this program, please make additional comments about the faculty member on a seperate page and attach to this form.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

_____

Date: _____

July, 1973

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS

Extension Division

**D**

## Follow-up Program Evaluation Interview Schedule

Name of Interviewee: _____

Faculty who taught in the program: _____

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Hello, my name is _____. I am with the Extension Division of the University of Missouri-St. Louis and I am calling about the Extension program you attended at _____ on _____. If you will recall, the name of the program was _____. I am helping the Dean evaluate the program and would really appreciate your help. Do you have a few minutes to talk?

1. Do you remember participating in this program? Yes _____ No _____

2. Can you remember what your overall rating of the program was? _____

   _____

   Would you still rate it the same way now? Yes _____ No _____

3. Can you remember the name of an instructor who did an outstanding teaching job? Yes _____ No _____

4. Who? _____ What do you particularly remember about this instructor?

   Do you recall some things you learned from participating in the program?

5. Did your participating in the program in any way influence:

   your personal life? How?

   the way you do your job? How?

   your career development? How?

6. Would you recommend that someone else take the program? Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUL 23 1973
on Adult Education

July, 1973

_____ Name _____ Date